

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

KAREN M. ISAACSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARCIA L. FUDGE, Secretary of HUD;
JULIA R. GORDON, Assistant Secretary of
HUD and Federal Housing Administration
Commissioner; and UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND
URBAN DEVELOPMENT,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-000351-JHC

ORDER

Before the court is self-represented Plaintiff Karen M. Isaacson's motion for relief from the Court's order dismissing this matter (Dkt. # 24). *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(3); Dkt. # 21. Having reviewed the motion, pertinent portions of the record, and the governing law, the Court DENIES the motion.

Rule 60(b)(3) allows a party to move for relief from a final order because of "fraud (whether previously called intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party." "To prevail, the moving party must prove by clear and convincing evidence that the verdict was obtained through fraud, misrepresentation, or other misconduct and the

1 conduct complained of prevented the losing party from fully and fairly presenting the defense.”
2 *De Saracho v. Custom Food Mach., Inc.*, 206 F.3d 874, 880 (9th Cir. 2000).

3 In her Rule 60(b)(3) motion, Isaacson claims that opposing counsel participated in fraud
4 or deceit, warranting vacatur of the Court’s order dismissing the matter. *See generally* Dkt. # 24.
5 Yet Isaacson includes no clear and convincing evidence that the dismissal was obtained through
6 opposing counsel’s fraud, misrepresentation, or misconduct. Instead, the motion appears to
7 perpetuate Isaacson’s objections to opposing counsel’s legal arguments, relitigating the Court’s
8 determinations of law regarding Isaacson’s Article III standing.¹ For these reasons, the Court
9 DENIES Isaacson’s motion (Dkt. # 24).

10 Dated this 28th day of November, 2023.

11
12 

13 John H. Chun
14 United States District Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 ¹ The Court has already denied Isaacson’s motion for reconsideration. *See* Dkt. ## 22, 23.